



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,362	12/17/2003	Alik Teplitsky	MS1-1871US	8559
22801	7590	12/21/2006		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER PHAM, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/21/2006	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/738,362	TEPLITSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael D. Pham	2167	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael D. Pham *M.P.* (3) Richard Bucher (Reg. 57,971)
 (2) Cam Truong (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 December 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: Independent.

Identification of prior art discussed: Watson, Raja, and Logan.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the Watson, Raja, and Logan reference. Applicant's then suggested some ideas to further limit the claim, however the examiner was unable to fully address any specifics based on the agenda provided. The examiners suggested to provide proposed amendments for further consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required



A facsimile from

**Richard Bucher
Lee&Hayes**

509-327-9256
Fax: 509-323-8979

To: Examiner Michael Pham
Fax number: 571-273-3924

Date: 12/14/2006

Regarding: App. S/N 10/738,362(Atty. Docket No. MS1-1871US)

Comments:

Applicant wishes to discuss (1) the distinguishing features of the subject claims with respect to the cited references – specifically, the Watson, Raja and Logan references; (2) any suggestions the Office has with respect to advancing the prosecution of this matter.

More specifically, Applicant wishes to clarify its understanding of which portions/functionality of Watson/Logan and Raja the Office is relying on with respect to subject matter in the subject claims. Applicant also wishes to generally discuss some potential substantive arguments and some potential claim modifications with the Office.

Best regards,
Rich Bucher